

REMARKS

The Office Action (“Office Action”) has been received and carefully considered. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-20, 23 and 25-29 are pending in this application. In this response, claims 1-4, 6, 8-20, 23, and 25-29 are amended. No new matter has been added. Entry of the amendments to the claims is respectfully requested.

Reconsideration of the outstanding rejection in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

A. The 35 U.S.C. 101 Rejection

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 13-20, 23, and 25-29 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is hereby traversed.

“A claimed process is patent-eligible under § 101 if: (1) it is tied to a particular machine or apparatus, or (2) it transforms a particular article into a different state or thing.” In re Bilski, 545 F.3d 943, 954 (Fed. Cir. 2008). That is, “a claimed process involving a fundamental principle that uses a particular machine or apparatus would not pre-empt uses of the principle that do not also use the specified machine or apparatus in the manner claimed.” Id. Also, “a claimed process that transforms a particular article to a specified different state or thing by applying a fundamental principle would not pre-empt the use of the principle to transform any other article, to transform the same article but in a manner not covered by the claim, or to do anything other than transform the specified article.” Id. Thus, “a claim that is tied to a particular machine or brings about a particular transformation of a particular article does not pre-empt all uses of a fundamental principle in any field but rather is limited to a particular use, a specific application.” Id. at 957. However, even if a claim recites a specific machine or a particular

transformation of a specific article, the recited machine or transformation must not constitute mere “insignificant postsolution activity.” Id.

The Office Action asserts that claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 13-20, 23, and 25-29 are related to methods for validating credentials, and these claims do not require these methods to be implemented by a particular machine. Applicant respectfully disagrees. However, in order to forward the present application toward allowance, Applicant has amended claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 13-20, 23, and 25-29 to more clearly recite a process that is tied to a particular machine or apparatus. In particular, the amended claims recite a method that is tied to “a first apparatus,” and “a second apparatus.” Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are statutory.

Also, the Office Action asserts that claims 10 and 11 are directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully disagrees. However, in order to forward the present application toward allowance, Applicant has amended claims 10 and 11 to more clearly recite a process that: (1) is tied to a particular machine or apparatus, or (2) transforms a particular article into a different state or thing. In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 10 and 11 recite a “non-transitory computer-readable medium.” Clearly, amended claims 10 and 11 recite a method that is tied to a particular machine or apparatus. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10 and 11 are statutory.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the aforementioned non-statutory subject matter rejection of claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 13-20, 23, and 25-29 be withdrawn.

B. CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons outlined above, Applicant respectfully asserts that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully solicited.

For any fees due in connection with filing this Response the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


HUNTON & WILLIAMS

Dalei Dong
Registration No. 60,363

James R. Miner
Registration No. 40,444

Hunton & Williams LLP
1900 K Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109
(202) 955-1500

Dated: July 15, 2010